United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/28/JPN/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
23 August 2017

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Twenty-eighth session
6 – 17 November 2017

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Japan*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 37 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

II. Information provided by stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations[2] and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies[3]

2. JWCHR called for early ratification of ICCPR-OP1.[4] JFBA JS5, AI and HRN recommended ratifying ICCPR-OP2, aiming at the abolition of death penalty.[5] APMM, JFBA, AI, JS9 and JS10 called for ratification without reservations to the ICRMW.[6] JS10 recommended accession to the 1954 and 1961 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons and the Reduction of Statelessness.[7]

3. JFBA was concerned Japan had not ratified the International Labour Organization Discrimination (ILO) Convention (No. 111).[8] JS9 recommended the ratification of the ILO Convention No. (97) (Migration for Employment Convention (Revised), Convention No. (143) (Migrant workers (Supplementary provisions) and Convention No. (111) concerning Discrimination in Respect of Employment and Occupation.[9] JS11 called for ratification of

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

the ILO Convention concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries No. (169).[10]

4. MINDAN and HRN called for the withdrawal of reservations on Article 4 (a) and (b) of ICERD.[11] JS9 called for withdrawal of the reservation to the ICESCR Article 8(1) d and 13(2), and Article 22(2) of the ICCPR.[12]

5. JFBA was concerned with Japan's reluctance to fulfill various treaty bodies' recommendations on the basis that it had no obligations to observe non-legally-binding recommendations, and that the Government cancelled the scheduled visit of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression at the last minute in 2015.[13]

6. CS urged inviting the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples to visit.[14]

B. National human rights framework[15]

7. AI, JFBA, JS2, JS3, MINDAN and KHRF noted Japan had not established a National Human Rights Institution, and urged taking immediate steps to establish an independent, impartial and credible institution in accordance with the Paris Principles.[16]

8. CS urged Japan to create a National Action plan on implementing the rights of Indigenous Peoples based on the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples' Outcome Document.[17]

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Cross cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination[18]

9. JFBA, AI, MINDAN and KHRF were concerned that a comprehensive anti-racial discrimination legislation was not yet drafted, and recommended its enactment to provide equal protection against discrimination for all persons on all grounds.[19] JS2 urged adoption of a comprehensive law with adequate and corresponding penal provisions and provision of human rights training to law enforcement officers to prevent hate speech, hate crimes and excessive use of force.[20]

10. AI, HRN, ACSILs and JS4 were concerned that despite enactment of an anti-hate speech law in 2016, it failed to ban advocacy of hatred or set any penalties.[21] JS4 called for measures to regulate hate speech and hate crimes by reviewing legislation.[22] JS4, HRN, MINDAN and AIPR, urged enforcement of the 2016 law in view of the existence of hate-speech or crime and to formulate legislation that restricts and punishes this behavior.[23] AIPR was concerned that hate speech directed towards Ryukyu people had increased sharply.[24] HRN was concerned hate speech was often xenophobic, with ethnically Korean and Chinese persons frequently targeted.[25]

11. MINDAN was concerned foreigners in Japan, including Koreans, face significant levels of discrimination particularly in the field of housing, employment and marriage.[26]

12. JS4 encouraged Japan to eliminate all forms of discrimination against Koreans and ensure a safe environment so that children of Korean origin can show their ethnic identity in public places and intensify measures to combat racial discrimination in the media. It also noted that hate speech and hate crimes against children attending Korean schools had

repeatedly occurred whenever tension between Japan and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea increased since 1980s.[27]

13. JFBA stated that no law prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity existed.[28] KHRF, AI and HRN reported some progress made to eliminate discrimination based on sexual orientations of LGBTI, despite Japan failing to implement previously accepted UPR recommendations and continued to be concerned that discrimination against them continued in various forms.[29] KHRF stated that the Constitution prohibited discrimination on the basis of race, sex, social status or family origin, while excluding discrimination on sexual orientation, gender identity or intersex status.[30] KHRF noted in 2012, Japan repealed Article 23(1) of the Basic Act for Housing, which previously excluded LGBTI couples from public housing rental. However, the amended law gave municipalities discretion in relation to public housing, resulting in continued discrimination. It also noted that no protections exist for LGBTI people under employment law. KHRF recommended enacting marriage equality law, to create a legally-recognized form of LGBTI partnership.[31]

14. JS13 was concerned that public awareness and understanding of LGBTI people remained low and urged measures to be taken to enact national laws that explicitly prohibit discrimination based on all grounds. It called for enforcement of the legislation prohibiting gender-motivated violence.[32]

15. AI noted discrimination against LGBTI people in accessing essential services such as health, legal and welfare. It recommended that Japan allow individuals to change their name and gender through a quick, accessible, transparent procedure, and in accordance with the individual's sense of gender identity, and abolish requirements to undergo psychiatric assessment and other medical requirements.[33]

16. HRW noted national law mandates people to obtain a mental disorder diagnosis and of other procedures, including sterilization to be legally recognized according to their gender identity. The current law contains a number of requirements that violate human rights and affect transgender children.[34] HRW and JS13 urged Japan to revise the Gender Identity Disorder Law, to replace humiliating mandatory procedures with self-identification criteria for legal gender recognition.[35]

Development, the environment, and business and human rights[36]

17. JFBA was concerned of business activities by Japan-based multinational corporations in countries with inadequate human rights legal protection, leading to human rights violations. It encouraged Japan to adopt a national action plan pursuant to United Nations guidance.[37]

18. IUVENTUM noted the state of emergency based on Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant Accident in effect from March 2011, allowing the Government to set the safety standard. Despite significant decontamination efforts, many locations were excluded from the procedures putting decontaminated spots at risk of re-contamination. In a recent report, the airborne radioactivity level in Fukushima was higher than elsewhere, nevertheless the Government was returning evacuees to the contaminated areas above 1msv/year radiation.[38] Greenpeace recommended dissemination of accurate, and easily accessible information regarding radiation and risk levels, and to reduce the acceptable additional annual exposure level in Fukushima-impacted areas to a maximum of 1 mSv/year, which would reflect the international standard.[39]

19. JS7 observed a misuse or abuse of budget formulation authority and was concerned that the government budget plan for Fiscal Year 2017 had a substantial reduction of about 6% for Ryukyu/Okinawa's development, compared with the initial budget for Fiscal Year 2016.[40]

2. Civil and Political Rights

Right to life, liberty and security of the person[40]

20. AI, HRW, HRN, JFBA and JS5 were concerned about the continued executions. Since Japan's 2012 UPR, the number of persons sentenced to death and executed had increased.[41] AI, HRN and JS5 regretted rejection of UPR recommendations to take steps towards abolition of the death penalty and establishment of an official moratorium on executions. Japan continued to refer to the majority public support for death sentences in cases of violent crimes as the reason for retaining the punishment and has stated that it has no plans to establish a forum to discuss the death penalty system. Additionally, a number of people with mental, psycho-social or intellectual disabilities had already been executed and others remain on death-row. They urged introducing a formal moratorium on executions and commuting all death sentences to terms of imprisonment as a first step toward the abolition of the death penalty and ensuring that conditions of detention complied with United Nations Standards.[42] JS5 reported that Japan's Penal Code does not limit the death penalty to the most serious crimes and urged amending it to crimes resulting in death in which the defendant had the intent to kill.[43]

21. JS5 stated that the "peace of mind" objective enshrined in Japan's legal code violates human rights of death-row inmates. It regretted that the laws and practices governing the prison system violated international norms and constituted cruel and unusual treatment, resulting in indefinite and prolonged solitary confinement of death-row inmates and in some cases barring confidential communications between inmates and their legal counsel. It thus encouraged Japan to conform to the revised Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners.[44]

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law[45]

22. JS5 noted the weak legal system allowed for the possibility of wrongful convictions, confessions and executions with no mandatory appeal system for death sentences. Japan's lay judge system requires a majority of a nine-judge panel, and not a unanimous decision, to determine guilt and impose a death sentence. They recommended amending the Act on Criminal Trials with the Participation of Saiban-in to require unanimous decisions for verdicts of guilt and death sentences.[47]

23. HRN and HRW noted that pretrial detention could last up to 23 days. There is no pretrial bail, attorneys are not permitted in custodial interrogations and videotaping was limited, which raise the risks of police abuse and coercive self-incrimination.[48] HRN encouraged Japan to ensure custodial interrogation is videotaped, that a defendant's lawyer is present, and that prosecutors disclose all evidence.[49]

24. SJE stated that all Dutch nationals present in the Dutch East Indies, were subjected to cruelties committed by the Japanese Military and their enforced "allies" during World War II. SJE urged Japan to clear its past honorably and directly with the victims.[50] JWCHR urged Japan to restore the honor of those who were against the aggressive war and colonial rule, carried out by Japan under the pre-war Meiji Constitution and to apologize to the victims in accordance with international human rights laws.[51]

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life[52]

25. JWCHR reported that since October 2003, the Tokyo Board of Education has continued to order public schools to sing the national anthem under the national flag during school events, and has punished those who disobeyed, contrary to their rights to freedom of thought, conscience, opinion and expression. The song and the flag are highly controversial because of the roles they played before and during the Second World War. JWCHR urged

taking appropriate measures to make local governments refrain from coercing the national symbols at educational scenes.[25]

26. HRN was concerned about the attempted state control of media and journalism, that may impact its independence through suggestions that it could revoke licenses based on Article 4 of the Broadcast Act, which called on broadcasters to be politically neutral and not distort facts. It urged refraining from misapplying the Act and reviewing the Specially Designated Secrets Act "SDA".[26] JS2 noted interference and forcible removal of journalists reporting the protest activities in Henoko and Takae and recommended Japan to guarantee the independence of media and press freedom including through conducting human rights training for law enforcement officers. JS2 was concerned the Japanese police used oppressive and violent measures against protesters and encouraged Japan to ensure and guarantee the freedom of peaceful assembly and expression particularly in Okinawa.[27]

27. JLBA noted the State Secrecy Law jeopardized freedom of expression and the right to access information and urged Japan to repeal the law or fundamentally review it pursuant to international standards.[28]

28. JLBA and MINDAN stated that under Japanese laws, suffrage was limited to those who held Japanese nationality. They urged Japan to enact legislation to grant voting rights in local government elections to foreigners with permanent resident status.[29]

29. JS9 was concerned that fire fighters and prison officers had no freedom of association rights and there was a total ban on all trade union rights for these workers. Public servants had no right to strike, and those who call a strike faced the risk of dismissal, a large fine, or imprisonment of up to three years. Public servants have no collective bargaining rights. It urged Japan to make appropriate revisions to Article (52) of the Local Public Service Act and to Articles 108-2(5) and 98 (2) and 110 (1) of the National Public Service Law, to permit these workers to organize trade unions and allow participation in strikes and introduce effective systems to ensure the right to bargain collectively.[30]

Prohibition of all forms of slavery[31]

30. AI and IHOR were concerned about the 2015 final and irreversible 'Agreement on the Comfort Women'[32] and the continued denial of senior Japanese government officials and public figures of its existence even after the Agreement was reached. They recommended providing full and effective redress, reparation, and rehabilitative services, the issuance of official apologies, making adequate references in textbooks, and condemning any attempts to defame victims or to deny the events took place.[33]

31. JWJP was concerned that there are many cases of racial discrimination against Japanese in foreign countries, due to the issue of "comfort women", and urged Japan to take measures to protect their human rights.[34] JS6 urged Japan to end violence against women by fully accepting the crimes of its military in the past, and give full reparation to the victims/survivors.[35] IHOR expressed similar concerns including the lack of a comprehensive victim-centred approach, and the need for "full and effective redress and reparation" for all victims.[36]

32. GAHT-US and IHOR argued that in regard to the comfort women, attempts to defame Japan and Japanese were continuing in foreign countries.[37] GAHT-US stated that Japan is one of the safest countries, and is not subjected to any organized human trafficking in recent decades. It estimated about 20,000 women above the age of 18 recruited as comfort women were compensated.[38]

Right to privacy and family life[66]

33. AT noted that an online leak of sensitive information in 2010 revealed that Japanese police had been conducting systematic and extensive surveillance and information gathering activities targeting Muslims under the guidance of the National Police Agency. It called on the police to terminate this practice, provide anti-profiling training for law enforcement personnel and establish guidelines prohibiting profiling based on religion and national origin.[67] AI was concerned that in May 2016, the Supreme Court dismissed a case brought against the police practice of blanket surveillance of Japan's Muslim community. It urged Japan to ensure the rights of all persons to protection from unlawful communication surveillance, allowing only for distinctions and differences in treatment that are reasonable, objective and based on legitimate and overriding grounds.[68]

34. HRN urged Japan to cease surveillance of those cooperating with the United Nations and to implement the preliminary recommendations of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression.[69]

35. JFBA was concerned the new Social Security and Tax Number System showing the centralized management of personal information by the Government and companies may present a grave threat to the right to privacy, and additionally, urged Japan to legislate the use of surveillance cameras and to obtain geographic position information of persons by strict standards.[70]

3. Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work[71]

36. JFBA noted the gender pay gap had not narrowed. It urged Japan to enact legislation to ensure the principle of equal remuneration for work of equal value and establish job evaluation based on international standards.[72]

Right to social security[73]

37. JFBA was concerned the tax and social security system was weak in redistribution of income, and did not adhere to the principle of affordable burden and that the relative poverty rate had increased to as high as 16.1 percent in 2012.[74]

Right to an adequate standard of living[75]

38. Greenpeace was concerned the Fukushima disaster resulted in an ongoing human security crisis especially for vulnerable groups. It considered the violations in the aftermath of the disaster as systemic policy failure and lack of legislative action on known issues. Greenpeace encouraged Japan to ensure survivors were fully compensated for their losses.[76]

Right to health[77]

39. IUVENTUM urged Japan to continue the current financial support for the voluntary evacuees of Fukushima disaster.[78] Greenpeace was concerned that the mental consequences were pervasive and potentially life-threatening, particularly for women and girls, who were also at a greater economic and political disadvantage from the current reconstruction policies due to their vulnerability to the health effects of radiation exposure.[79] HRN was concerned about children who were diagnosed with or believed to have thyroid cancer and urged improvement of health monitoring and services.[80]

40. JFBA was concerned no law stipulated patients' rights in Japan including the rights to receive safe, quality medical care and urged enacting relevant legislation.[81]

41. JS2 and JS14 were concerned that the United States (U.S.) military bases continued to cause grave health, environmental and social problems in Okinawa including "noise pollution", aircraft related accidents, and land contamination.[82] JS14 urged Japan to: conduct a survey on the safety of residents; to take effective measures, including the creation of "clear zones" at Futenma to protect and remedy the damage inflicted upon the local people; to approve on-site inspections in third country bases and training areas by the local government and civil society; to enact legal amendments necessary to protect the right of local residents to access water sources free from contamination; to conduct full-scale investigation of possible consequences of water contamination caused by constructing Self-Defense Forces (SDF) bases in the Miyako Islands and to publicize all findings.[83]

42. JS8 noted that the second-generation Atomic-bomb survivors were at risk from the genetic effects of radiation and that the survivors suffered from severe discrimination and social prejudice, urging that measures be taken to guarantee the human rights of victims.[84]

Right to education[85]

43. ACSILs called for inclusion of references to the historical existence of Lew Chew as an independent nation in textbooks.[86] JS7 and JS11 were concerned that education textbooks did not adequately reflect the history and culture of the Ryūkyūans, urging the government to provide appropriate opportunities to receive education in the language of Ryukyu/Okinawa.[87] JS7 recommended establishing an independent mechanism to monitor contemporary forms of discrimination against the people of Ryukyu/Okinawa.[88]

44. JS4 was concerned that minority children faced various difficulties given that the "miscellaneous schools", whereby minority children are educated in their own language, are not accredited as regular schools. In order to be accredited, the school has to fulfil the criteria, which is almost impossible, particularly if a minority community wants to educate and to use textbooks written in their own language. Graduates of Korean high schools also received unequal treatment with regard to access to higher education.[89] JS4 urged reviewing the legislation on school education to officially recognize foreign schools as regular schools, to ensure the right to education of minority children, and to recognize the Korean schools graduates' certificates as university entrance examination qualifications, on the same footing as other foreign schools.[90]

45. JS4, JFOR and LAZAK were concerned Japan excluded the students of Korean high schools from the "Tuition Waiver and Tuition Support Fund Program for High School Education".[91] JS4 and LAZAK recommended including Korean schools as recipients of this program and to invite local governments to resume or maintain the provision of subsidies to Korean schools.[92]

46. JFBA noted that the human rights treaties or discrimination issues were not incorporated in the curriculum guidelines for elementary to high school level.[93]

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women[94]

47. JS12 noted that the number of U.S. military personnel in Okinawa was 68.4% of the total of the U.S. Forces in Japan. It was concerned that since the arrival of the Forces in 1945, sexual assault cases targeting women had not stopped and continued to threaten the safety of the women of Okinawa. It requested Japan to conduct a factual investigation and announce results on the exact measures taken by U.S. Forces in a transparent way, particularly those in Okinawa, similar to the reform made to the Bonn Agreement to allow the appropriate country's police to carry out a proper investigation on behalf of the victims of sexual assaults committed by American military personnel.[95]

48. JFBA was concerned no discrimination law comprehensively prohibited discrimination against women, and that 23.7 percent of women had experienced spousal violence, since the revised anti-domestic violence law only applied to cohabitating couples.[96] HRN was concerned that marital rape is not explicitly criminalized and the age of sexual consent remains 13 years. Recently proposed amendments to the rape laws are grossly insufficient as the law falls behind international standards, and thus urged amending the Penal Code to expand the definition of rape and to criminalize all sexual conduct without consent.[97]

49. Greenpeace noted in relation to Fukushima catastrophe, women continued to be significantly underrepresented in decision-making, and thus called for equal public participation of women and development of support initiatives for financial independence.[98]

50. HRN was concerned women and girls were coerced into filming pornographic videos after being scouted as non-pornographic models or actresses. It urged intensifying efforts to eliminate sexual exploitation.[99]

Children[100]

51. JS1 was concerned about violence against children, and urged awareness-raising by both public and civil society bodies.[101]

52. JS1 and GIEACPC noted that corporal punishment of children was not yet explicitly prohibited by law in all settings except in school and was not explicitly prohibited in the alternative care setting and day care facilities, as well as the penal system.[102] GIEACPC recalled that Japan had accepted a second cycle UPR recommendation to explicitly prohibit corporal punishment in all settings, while the 2017 mid-term report of Japan responded vaguely saying that "while the meaning of "corporal punishment" is not absolutely clear, the act of assault (Penal Code Article 208) or injury (Penal Code Article 204) can be punished".[103] JS1 reported that the bill on amending the Child Welfare Act does not include provision to legally prohibit corporal punishment.[104]

53. JFBA was concerned that child abuse resulting in death continued, despite the measures stipulated in the Act for the Promotion of Measures against Bullying 2013. It urged prohibiting in its legislation corporal and other cruel or degrading punishment and to remove Article 822 (right to discipline a child) of the Civil Code, and raise awareness in this regard.[105]

Persons with disabilities[106]

54. JS3 noted that despite Japan's ratification of the ICRPD, new legislation and policies did not include persons with dementia, psychosocial and intellectual disability. It urged repealing the Mental Health and Welfare for the Mentally Disabled, implementing the comprehensive deinstitutionalisation plan for psychiatric hospitals, and establishing a monitoring system independent from the government.[107]

55. HRW regretted that no major reform had been proposed to address stigma against persons with disabilities despite enacting the 2016 Act on the Elimination of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities.[108]

56. AI was concerned that a number of people with mental, psycho-social or intellectual disabilities had already been executed and other prisoners remained on death row who may suffer from similar mental conditions. It noted Japan did not have effective safeguards to avoid the application of the death penalty to those with serious mental or intellectual disabilities, nor did it regularly carry out psychiatric evaluations.[109]

57. JFBA noted with concern that the current healthcare system allowed excessive physical restraints and involuntary medication for mental disorders.[110] JS3 was concerned

that there were 300,000 patients in psychiatric hospitals - about 200,000 patients staying for over 1 year and over 36,000 patients staying over 20 years - that new coercive hospitalisation had increased by 2-3 times in two decades, and that about 40 percent of inpatients were subject to coercive hospitalisation.[111]

Minorities and indigenous peoples[112]

58. MINDAN and LAZAK were concerned that the Japanese Government had continually denied Korean residents were a national or ethnic minority as defined in Article 27 of the ICCPR or the United Nations Declaration on Minority Rights. Moreover, there were no measures taken for establishing the conditions necessary for protection and promotion of the cultural and linguistic identity of Korean residents.[113]

59. MINDAN called on Japan to establish a comprehensive basic law for protecting the rights of residents and their descendants from the former colonies of Japan, such as Koreans.[114]

60. AIPR, JS2, JS7 and JS11 were concerned Japan had neither recognized Ryukyuans as an indigenous people, nor taken measures to protect their traditional culture, history and language.[115] JS2, JS7 and JS14 urged Japan to recognize the people of Ryukyu/Okinawa as indigenous people, and to take concrete measures to protect their rights to their traditional land and natural resources, ensuring respect for their right to engage in free, prior and informed consent in policies that affect them.[116]

61. JFBA and IMADR were concerned that discrimination on the ground of "descent" against Burakumin, which is the largest minority community, remained in employment, marriage, and housing, etc. Racist groups repeatedly conduct discriminatory propaganda activities around Buraku areas. Incitement to discrimination is still rampant on the Internet. It called for the reinforcement of the Act on the promotion of elimination of Buraku discrimination considering the Personal Information Protection Commission opinion that those cases are not within the scope of the "sensitive personal information".[117] IMADR was concerned that women from minority/indigenous communities faced challenges such as: domestic violence, disparity in educational status within their community and in relation to women from the majority group. It urged measures to improve employment of indigenous and minority women, ensuring proper working conditions and providing assistance in finding decent jobs.[118]

62. IMADR urged Japan to provide counselors at the public consultation service with training tailored to conditions of victims from minority communities, as well as provide them with educational opportunities and support.[119]

63. CS stated that in recent years Japan has taken legal steps and measures in cultural areas to end systemic discrimination against the Ainu. It noted that measures in the Cultural Protection Act were not derived from the fact that the Ainu are an Indigenous Peoples, nor are they predicated on the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. It noted that Ainu individuals continued to suffer greater rates of poverty. It urged Japan to continue making strides to engage the Ainu people, and to promote the resurgent development of Ainu culture and heritage and ensure participation in decision-making.[120] JFBA called on Japan to implement comprehensive measures incorporating social, cultural, political, and educational perspectives, considering the Ainu's history as an indigenous people.[121] ACSILs urged Japan to immediately create anti-racial discrimination laws to protect indigenous peoples as well as provide thorough instruction on the right of indigenous peoples in the human rights curriculum of police academies.[122]

64. JS11 called on Japan to ensure that the history of Ainu and Ryūkyūans are properly represented in textbooks used in school curricula, as well as ensuring their rights were promoted and protected.[123]

65. JS11 noted Japan voted in favor of adopting the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, but did not recognize the unconditional right to self-determination.[124] JS14 and ACSILs were concerned that the Government is constructing new bases and facilities for the U.S. military and its SDF, despite local opposition. The construction of this new air base in Henoko and "helipads" for MV-22 Osprey aircraft in Takae in northern Okinawa Island impacted both the people living in those areas and the biodiversity-rich environment. The construction could also jeopardize the northern part of Okinawa Island's bid for UNESCO's World Natural Heritage status. They recommended to stop immediately the construction and start the immediate demilitarization and decolonization of Lew Chew.[125]

Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers and internally displaced persons[126]

66. HRW regretted that weak legal protection for migrant workers resulted in abuses despite Japan accepting recommendations to protect their rights. Highlighting that the Labour Standards Bureau statistics in 2015 recognized 3,695 cases of labour standards violations, the highest since 2003.[127] AI and APMM called for policy reforms to ensure the human rights and dignity of migrant workers and members of their families, irrespective of their status, and that employers suspected of being responsible for abusing their rights were brought promptly to justice.[128]

67. AI and JFBA were concerned about reports, in relation to the Technical Intern Training Program (TITP), of sexual abuse, work-related deaths and working conditions amounting to forced labour and trafficking.[129] JS9 noted industries continued to use the TITP immigration scheme of low-skilled migrant workers under the misleading classification of 'interns', where in reality they performed key roles in vital sectors.[130] SMJ and APMM regretted that the TITP functioned as a measure to secure "extremely low cost labour" for small and mid-sized companies that suffered from labour shortage. In addition, they restricted workers' freedoms in their private lives, such as banning possession of mobile phones, preventing them from staying away overnight, or changing their receiving organization.[131] SMJ, JFBA and APMM urged reviewing and regulating the program to prevent human rights violations and enacting an anti-human trafficking law that covers the training program.[132]

68. APMM was concerned about increasing trends of abuses, exploitation, deceit, human trafficking, Government neglect and other human rights violations against migrants and recommended that the Government prosecute recruitment agencies, brokers and employers that exploited migrant workers and provide effective mechanisms to protect migrants and enact an anti-human trafficking law that will cover the training program and protect migrants from becoming victims of human trafficking. APMM stated that the abusive and exploitative condition besetting many marriage migrants in Japan resulted in a big number of single mothers, who take sole care of their children after they divorce their Japanese spouses.[133]

69. APMM was concerned about increasing trend of domestic violence and other human rights violations with regard to married migrants and recommended that Japan grant residency visas to foreign spouses of Japanese citizens without the letter of guarantee from their spouses currently required for granting such visas, and to criminalize spousal abuse and impose harsher penalties on perpetrators.[134]

70. MINDAN regretted that foreigners including former colonialized Koreans in Japan, were not eligible for various public positions. It called for the elimination of all legislation, administrative rules and practices which implicitly or explicitly prohibit foreigners from being promoted to managerial positions in local government offices.[135]

71. AI was concerned asylum-seekers waited for years in financial difficulty and uncertainty, not knowing whether they would be able to settle in Japan. A majority of Syrian refugees were unable to apply due to Japan's strict criteria, which excluded the most vulnerable who were in urgent need of protection, even after Japan announced in 2016 its aim of accepting up to 150 Syrian refugees over five years.[136]

72. AI urged Japan to ensure the refugee status determination process was conducted in a fair, effective and transparent manner in line with international law and standards, including the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees.[137]

Stateless persons[138]

73. JS10 noted Japan has not established a statelessness status determination procedure or complementary protection mechanism from arbitrary detention. Stateless persons residing in Japan irregularly are at risk of arrest, detention and deportation. It urged Japan to: introduce the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons definition of "stateless person" into Japanese law; establish a statelessness determination procedure that is fair, effective and accessible regardless of legal status; revise article 8(4) of Japan's Nationality Law (Revised Act No.70 of June 13, 2014) to ensure that all children born in Japan who do not acquire another nationality are automatically conferred Japanese nationality at birth; ensure that statelessness is considered to be a valid ground for granting "Special Permission to Stay"; and to ensure that all stateless persons who resided irregularly in Japan have the opportunity to regularise their status.[139]

Notes

[1] The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org.
Civil society
Individual submissions:

ACSILs	The Association of Comprehensive Studies for Independence of the Lew Chewans (ACSILs) Ginowan City, Ryukyu (Okinawa) (Japan);
AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom);
AIPR	Association of Indigenous Peoples in Ryukyus, Okinawa (Japan);
APMM	Asia Pacific Mission for Migrants, Hong Kong (China);
CS	Cultural Survival, Cambridge (United Kingdom);
GAHT-US-Corporation	GAHT-US-Corporation, Santa Monica (California) (U.S.A.);
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London (United Kingdom);
Greenpeace	Greenpeace Japan NF, Tokyo (Japan);
HMJR	Researcher of History on Modern Japan, Tokyo (Japan);
HRN	Human Rights Now, Tokyo (Japan);
HRW	Human Rights Watch;
IMADR	International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, Tokyo (Japan);
IUVENTUM	IUVENTUM, (Germany);
JFBA	Japan Federation of Bar Associations, Tokyo (Japan);
JFOR	Japan Fellowship of Reconciliation, Wakayama (Japan);
JWCHR	The Japanese Workers' Committee For Human Rights, Toshima-ku, Tokyo, (Japan);
JWJP	Japanese Women for Justice and Peace, Tokyo, (Japan);
KHRF	Kaleidoscope Human Rights Foundation, Melbourne, (Australia);

LAZAK	Lawyers Association of Zainichi Koreans, Osaka, (Japan);
Mindan	Korean Residents Union in Japan, Tokyo, (Japan);
AT	Attorney Team for Victims of Illegal Investigation against Muslims, Tokyo, (Japan);
SJE/JES	Stichting Japanse Ereschulden /Foundation of Japanese Honorary Debts, The Hague (Netherlands);
SMJ	Solidarity Network with Migrants Japan, Tokyo, (Japan).
Joint submissions:	
JS1	**Joint submission 1 submitted by:** CAP Center JAPAN; Eyes for Children in Tokai; Fathering Japan; General Research Institute of the Convention on the Right of the Child; Human Rights Watch; Initiative for Ending Violence against Children Japan; Japan Network for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect; Japan Society of Physical Education, Health and Sport Sciences; 'miku'- Parenting Magazine; Momrings; MY TREE Parents Program Center; Network for the Convention on the Rights of the Child; Nippon Children Parents Supporter; NPO Palette CRC Supporting Center; Save the Children Japan; SBI Children's Hope Foundation; Support Center for Foster Families in Chiba; Tiger Mask Fundation;
JS2	**Joint submission 2 submitted by:** JNGMDP: Japan National Group of Mentally Disabled People; and WNUSP: World Network of Users and Survivors of Psychiatry, Tokyo (Japan);
JS3	**Joint submission 3 submitted by:** JNGMDP: Japan National Group of Mentally Disabled People and World Network of Users and Survivors of Psychiatry WNUSP, Tokyo (Japan);
JS4	**Joint submission 4 submitted by:** Human Rights Association for Korean Residents in Japan (HURAK) and the International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR);
JS5	**Joint submission 5 submitted by:** The Advocates for Human Rights, Minnesota (USA); The Center for Prisoners' Rights (Japan) and The World Coalition against the Death Penalty, Montreuil (France);
JS6	**Joint submission 6 submitted by:** Women's Active Museum on War and Peace (WAM), Tokyo (Japan) and Japanese Committee for Filipino "Comfort Women" (JCFCW);
JS7	**Joint submission 7 submitted by:** All Okinawa Council for Human Rights and International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR);
JS8	**Joint submission 8 submitted by:** Japanese Liaison Council of Second-Generation Atomic Bomb Survivors;
JS9	**Joint submission 9 submitted by:** The International Centre for Trade Union Rights (ICTUR), London, (United Kingdom) and National Confederation of Trade Unions (Zenroren);
JS10	**Joint submission 10 submitted by:** Institute on Statelessness and Inclusion (ISI) and Statelessness Network Asia Pacific (SNAP);
JS11	**Joint submission 11 submitted by:** Association of Indigenous Peoples in the Ryukyus (AIPR) Okinawa (Japan), Shimin Gaikou Centre (Citizens' Diplomatic Center for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples) Tokyo (Japan), Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP) Chiang Mai (Thailand), International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) Copenhagen (Denmark);

JS12	**Joint submission 12 submitted by:** Asia-Pacific Human Rights Information Center (HURIGHTS OSAKA), All Okinawa Council for Human Rights, Okinawa women act against military violence and Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Kyoto (WILPF kyoto);
JS13	**Joint submission 13 submitted by:** Equality (Gay Japan News) Tokyo (Japan) and RC-NET, Aomori (Japan);
JS14	**Joint submission 14 submitted by:** Okinawa Environment Network, All Okinawa Council for Human Rights, Plaintiff Group for Third Lawsuit against Aircraft Noise of Kadena Airbase, Plaintiff Group against Aircraft Noise of Futenma Airbase, The Informed-Public-Project, Okinawa Environmental Justice Project, Tida no Fua Group to Make Peaceful Future for the Islander Children, Takahara, Okinawa City, (Japan).

[2] The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:

ICERD	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;
OP-ICESCR	Optional Protocol to ICESCR;
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;
ICCPR-OP 1	Optional Protocol to ICCPR;
ICCPR-OP 2	Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty;
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women;
OP-CEDAW	Optional Protocol to CEDAW;
CAT	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;
OP-CAT	Optional Protocol to CAT;
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child;
OP-CRC-AC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict;
OP-CRC-SC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography;
OP-CRC-IC	Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure;
ICRMW	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families;
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities;
OP-CRPD	Optional Protocol to CRPD;
ICPPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

[3] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.2, 147.3, 147.1, 147.4, 147.5, 147.6, 147.7, 147.106, 147.112, 147.8, 147.9, 147.10, 147.24, 147.25, 147.26, 147.13, 147.11, 147.12, 147.15, 147.27, 147.28, 147.29, 147.30, 147.17, 146.18, 147.16, 147.20, 147.21, 147.22, 147.23, 147.19.

[4] JWCHR, page 1.

[5] JFBA, page 3, HRN, page 11. See also the Mid-term Report on the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations issued at the second cycle of the Universal Periodic Review, Jan. 2017, https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/japan/session_14_-_october_2012/japan_mid-term_2nd_cycle_2017.pdf. See also, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.34 (Canada), 147.35 (South Africa), 147.36 (Switzerland), 147.37(Uzbekistan), 147.40 (Iran (Islamic Republic of)), 147.63 (Cuba), 147.64 (Palestine), 147.84 (Namibia), 147.85 (Norway), 147.91 (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), 147.92 (Tunisia), 147.161 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), and 147.166 (Sudan). JS 5 page 8, para 32, AI, page 2 and 6. See also, A/HRC/22/14, recommendations 147.6 (Rwanda, Switzerland), 147.7(Uruguay), 147.8(Australia), 147.93 (Italy), 147.94(Namibia);

147.95 (Netherlands); 147.96(Norway); 147.97(Argentina); 147.98(Australia); 147.99(Mexico); 147.100(Italy); 147.101(Ireland); 147.102(Germany); 147.103(France); 147.104(Finland); 147.105(Norway); 147.106(Portugal); 147.107 (Slovakia); 147.108(Slovenia); 147.109(Spain); 147.110(Switzerland); 147.111(Turkey); 147.112 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and 147.113 (Austria).

[6] APMM, page 3, JFBA, page 3. See also, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.34 (Canada), 147.35 (South Africa), 147.36 (Switzerland), 147.37(Uzbekistan), 147.40 (Iran (Islamic Republic of)), 147.63 (Cuba), 147.64 (Palestine), 147.84 (Namibia), 147.85 (Norway), 147.91 (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), 147.92 (Tunisia), 147.161 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), and 147.166 (Sudan); and AI, page 7, and JS 9, page 7, para 22 and JS10, page 5-6.

[7] JS10, page 5, 6.

[8] JFBA, page 3. See also, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.34 (Canada), 147.35 (South Africa), 147.36 (Switzerland), 147.37(Uzbekistan), 147.40 (Iran (Islamic Republic of)), 147.63 (Cuba), 147.64 (Palestine), 147.84 (Namibia), 147.85 (Norway), 147.91 (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), 147.92 (Tunisia), 147.161 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), and 147.166 (Sudan).

[9] JS 9, page 7.

[10] JS11, page 2, page, 6.

[11] MINDAN, page 13. See also A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.34 (Canada), 147.35 (South Africa), 147.36 (Switzerland), 147.37(Uzbekistan), 147.40 (Iran (Islamic Republic of)), 147.63 (Cuba), 147.64 (Palestine), 147.84 (Namibia), 147.85 (Norway), 147.91 (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), 147.92 (Tunisia), 147.160 (Germany), 147.161 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), 147.163 (Myanmar), and 147.166 (Sudan) and HRN, page, 9.

[12] JS 9, page 7.

[13] JFBA, page 4.

[14] CS, page 6.

[15] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14 paras. 147.47; 147.48; 147.49; 147.50; 147.51; 147.52; 147.53; 147.54; 147.55; 147.56; 147.57; 147.58; 147.59.

[16] AI, page 2 and 6, MINDAN, page 5, JFBA, page 3 and JS2, page 11 and 12, JS3, page 2 and 5, KHRF, page 3, and 5. See also, A/HRC/22/14 paras. 147.47. (Nepal); 147.48. (Spain); 147.49. (Nicaragua); 147.50. (Tunisia); 147.51. (Ukraine); 147.52. (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland); 147.53. (Benin); 147.54. (Burkina Faso); 147.55. (France); 147.56. (Indonesia); 147.57. (Jordan); 147.58. (Malaysia); 147.59. (Mexico).

[17] CS, page 6.

[18] For relevant recommendations see, A/HRC/22/14 paras. 147.63; 147.89; 147.90; 147.85; 147.70; 147.84; 147.34; 147.36; 147.64; 147.65; 147.78; 147.32; 147.87; 147.91; 147.92.

[19] AI, page 6, KHRF, page 11 -12, MINDAN, page 5, and page 12 and 13 and JFBA, page 3. See also A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.84(Namibia); 147.87(United States of America); 147.90 (United States of America).

[20] JS2, page 7.

[21] AI, page 3, ACSILs, page 5, HRN, page 7-8, JS4, page 6 and 9. See also A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.36, 147.40, 147.60, 147.62, 147.64, 147.79, 147.161 and 147.165.

[22] JS4, page 6 and page 9.

[23] JS4, page 9, HRN, page 7-8, MINDAN, page 9,12 and 13, AIPR, page 6.

[24] AIPR, page 5.

[25] HRN, page 7-8.

[26] MINDAN, page 4-5, 9, 12 and 13. See also A/HRC/22/14, para. See also A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.34 (Canada), 147.35 (South Africa), 147.36 (Switzerland), 147.37(Uzbekistan), 147.40 (Iran (Islamic Republic of)), 147.63 (Cuba), 147.64 (Palestine), 147.84 (Namibia), 147.85 (Norway), 147.91 (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), 147.92 (Tunisia), 147.160 (Germany), 147.161 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), 147.163 (Myanmar), and 147.166 (Sudan).

[27] JS4, page 6 and 9. See also CERD/C/304/Add.114, para. 14, CERD/C/JPN/CO/3-6, para. 13, E/CN.4/2006/16/Add.2, para. 90.

[28] JFBA, page 4.

[29] KHRF, page 4-5, AI, page 4, page 6 and 7 and HRN, page 2, JFBA, page 4.

[30] KHRF, page 4-5.

[31] KHRF, page 2 and 11.

[32] JS13, page 3 and 5.
[33] AI, pages 4, 6 and 7.
[34] HRW, page 2.
[35] HRW, page 2, JS13, page 5.
[36] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.83; 147.173; 147.155; 147.75; 147.152; 147.88; 147.156.
[37] JFBA, page 2.
[38] IUVENTUM, page 1 and 5. See also, A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.37(Uzbekistan); 147.40 (Iran (Islamic Republic of)); 147.63 (Cuba); 147.64 (Palestine); 147.84 (Namibia); 147.85 (Norway); 147.91 (Democratic People's Republic of Korea); 147.92 (Tunisia); 147.161 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); and 147.166 (Sudan). See also https://www.iaca.org/sites/default/files/mfa_information_170323_full_report.pdf.
[39] Greenpeace, page 4.
[40] JS7, page 5.
[41] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.126; 147.97; 147.98; 147.94; 147.100; 147.104; 147.105; 147.107; 147.108; 147.109; 147.110; 147.111; 147.101; 147.102; 147.103; 147.113; 147.93; 147.99; 147.121; 147.123; 147.124; 147.125; 147.95; 147.144; 147.145; 147.96; 147.122.
[42] AI, page 2. See also, Amnesty International, Death Sentences and Executions 2014, www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/0001/2015/en/ (Index: ACT 50/0001/2015); Amnesty International, Death Sentences and Executions 2015, www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/3487/2016/en/ (Index: ACT 50/3487/2016); HRW, page 4. See also A/HRC/22/14 Recommendation 147.95 (Netherlands); HRN, page 11; and JFBA, page 4-5. JS5, page 2. See also, JFBA. Declaration Calling for Reform of the Penal System Including Abolition of the Death Penalty, adopted at the 59th JFBA Convention on the Protection of Human Rights on October 7, 2016. (English) http://www.nichibenren.or.jp/en/document/statements/year/2016/161007.html.
[43] AI, pages 2 and 7, JS5, page 2-6, and HRN, pages 11 and 13. See also, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.6 (Rwanda, Switzerland); 147.7(Uruguay); 147.8(Australia); 147.93 (Italy); 147.94(Namibia); 147.95 (Netherlands); 147.96(Norway); 147.97(Argentina); 147.98(Australia); 147.99(Mexico); 147.100(Italy); 147.101(Ireland); 147.102(Germany); 147.103(France); 147.104(Finland); 147.105(Norway); 147.106(Portugal); 147.107 (Slovakia); 147.108(Slovenia); 147.109(Spain); 147.110(Switzerland); 147.111(Turkey); 147.112(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and 147.113 (Austria). See also, Mid-term Report on the progress made in the implementation of recommendations issued at the second cycle of the Universal Periodic Review, Jan. 2017, https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/japan/session_14_-_october_2012/japan_mid-term_2nd_cycle_2017.pdf.
[44] JS5, pages 2, 5and 7.
[45] JS5, pages 6-8.
[46] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.44; 147.116; 147.117; 147.120; 147.118; 147.119.
[47] JS5, pages 2 and 8.
[48] HRW, page 4 and HRN, page 11. See also CCPR/C/JPN/CO/5. HRN 2008 UPR Report, id., at 2-3.
[49] HRN, page 11 and 12.
[50] SJE, page 2 and 4.
[51] JWCHR, page 5-6.
[52] For relevant recommendations see, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.152; 147.151.
[53] JWCHR, page 3-5. See also CCPR/C/JPN/Q/6 paragraph 22.
[54] HRN, page 5-7. See also, Japanese Constitution, article 21; United Nations Treaty Collection, "International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights," article 19, https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-4&chapter=4&clang=_en.
[55] JS2, pages 4-5, 8 and 11.
[56] JFBA, page 7. See also, ICCPR. CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6 http://www.nichibenren.or.jp/library/ja/kokusai/humanrights_library/treaty/data/CO_JPRep6_ICCPR_140820.pdf. See also, OHCHR. Preliminary observations by the United Nations Special Rapporteur

on the right to freedom of opinion and expression, Mr. David Kaye, at the end of his visit to Japan (12-19 April 2016)
http://www.ohchr.org/en/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=19842&LangID=E.

[47] JFBA, page 7; MINDAN, page 6-7.

[48] JS9, page 2 and 6-7.

[49] For relevant recommendations see, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.136, 147.133, 147.135, 147.137, 147.131, 147.134, 147.132.

[50] AI, page 4, 7; JFOR, page 2-3; AI, page 4. See also, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.145(Republic of Korea); 147.146(China); 147.147(Costa Rica); 147.158(Netherlands).

[51] JWJP, page 3 and 6. See also, A/HRC/22/14 paras. 147.51 (Zimbabwe); 147.60 (Jordan); 147.63 (Cuba).

[52] JS6, page 7. See also, A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.145 (Republic of Korea); 147.146(China); 147.147(Costa Rica); 147.158(Netherlands); 147.148. (Democratic People's Republic of Korea). See also the speech on March 10, 2016, during the 31st session of Human Rights Council: "Last year I highlighted the unresolved suffering, and search for justice, of the women who survived sexual slavery by Japanese military forces during World War II. Since then, in December 2015, the Governments of Japan and the Republic of Korea have announced a bilateral agreement to address the issue. Its terms have been questioned by various UN human rights mechanisms, and most importantly by the survivors themselves. It is fundamentally important that the relevant authorities reach out to these courageous and dignified women, ultimately only they can judge whether they have received genuine redress." See also, Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation for Victims of Gross Violations of International Human Rights Law and Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law (A/RES/60/147).

[53] HRW, page 3. See also, A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.147 (Costa Rica).

[54] GAHT-US Corporation, page 2; HMJR, page 2.

[55] GAHT-US Corporation, page 3.

[56] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.38, 147.43, 147.74, 147.149.

[57] Attorney Team, pages 1, 3 and 9.

[58] AI, page 3 and 7. See also The Asahi Shimbun, Compensation granted, regarding the case of leaked information on terrorism investigation by Tokyo Metropolitan Police Department), 2 June 2016, available at digital.asahi.com/articles/DA3S12369377.html.

[59] HRN, page 7. See Mandates of the Special Rapporteurs on the Promotion and Protection of the Right to Freedom of Opinion and Expression, on the Rights to Freedom of Peaceful Assembly and of Association, and on the Situation of Human Rights Defenders, [hereinafter "Mandates of the Special Rapporteurs"], UA JPN 4/2016, 30 May 2016, https://spdb.ohchr.org/hrdb/33rd/public_-_UA_JPN_30.05.16_(4.2016).pdf; see also Human Rights Council 2016 Report of the Secretary-General on Cooperation with the United Nations, its representatives and mechanisms in the field of human rights A/HRC/33/19, 16 Aug. 2016.
http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/SP/Pages/Actsofintimidationsandreprisal.aspx. Despite the Ministry of Foreign Affair's insistence that their internal investigation found the allegations to be baseless, HRN confirmed that FACTA has a copy of the memorandum. See HRN Statement on Independence of the Press, above note 37, at 5.

[60] JFBA, page 6.

[61] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14/Add.1, paras. 147.69, 147.76, 147.63, 147.70, 147.32, 147.151.

[62] JFBA, page 9. See also, OECD Stat "Real minimum wages"
https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=RMW.

[63] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.63, 147.32, 147.91, 147.161.

[64] JFBA, page 8. See also, MHLW Results of research analysis of the relative poverty rate and other factors, December 18, 2015, http://www.mhlw.go.jp/seisakunitsuite/bunya/hukushi_kaigo/seikatsuhogo/kekka_jyoukyou/chousa/tp151218-01.html.

[65] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14/Add.1, para. 147.32.

[66] Greenpeace, pages 1 and 4.

[67] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.155.

[68] JUVENTUM, page 1 and 2. See also, http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CRC.aspx. See also, http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/HRCouncil/RegularSession/Session23/A-HRC-23-41-Add5_en.pdf.

[59] Greenpeace, pages 1, 2-3. See also http://www.greenpeace.org/japan/Global/japan/pdf/Unequal-impact-en.pdf
[60] HRN, page 5.
[61] JFBA, page 10.
[62] JS2, page 7 and JS14, page 2.
[63] JS 14, pages 6 and 11.
[64] JS8, pages 3 and 4.
[65] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.157.
[66] ACMLs, page 4.
[67] JS11, page 3 and JS7, page 8. See also, (CERD/C/JPN/7-9), para. 21.
[68] JS7, page 8.
[69] JS4, page 1 and 3. See also, A/HRC/22/14 paras. 147.165 (Portugal); 147.36 (Switzerland); 147.64 (Palestine); 147.161 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); 147.60 (Jordan); 147.62 (Bhutan); 147.79(Uruguay); 147.36 (Switzerland); 147.64 (Palestine); 147.161 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); 147.60 (Jordan); 147.62 (Bhutan); 147.79 (Uruguay).
[70] JS 4, page 8-9.
[71] JS4, page 1, JFOR, page 7, LAZAK, page 8. See also, A/HRC/22/14 para. 147.91 (Democratic People's Republic of Korea).
[72] JS4, page 9 and LAZAK, page 3.
[73] JFBA, page 9.
[74] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.152; 147.151; 147.73; 147.147; 147.148; 147.145; 147.146; 147.130; 147.128; 147.127; 147.142; 147.138.
[75] JS12, page. 2 and 5.
[76] JFBA, page 4. See also, Gender Equality Bureau Cabinet Office. Survey on violence between men and women (Summary). March 2015. http://www.gender.go.jp/policy/no_violence/e-vaw/chousa/h26_boryoku_cyousa.html
[77] HRN, page 1, 3. See also, Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) "Concluding observations on the combined seventh and eighth periodic reports of Japan," UN Doc. CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, 7 March 2016. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8.
[78] Greenpeace, page 4.
[79] HRN, page 3.
[80] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.126; 147.39; 147.79.
[81] JS1, pages 5 and 6.
[82] JS 1, pages 2 and 4. GIEACPC, page 3. See also A/HRC/22/14, para147.126 (Hungary); A/HRC/8/44 para. 60.17.
[83] GIEACPC, page 1 and page 3-4. See also, A/HRC/22/14, recommendation 147.126. See also, CRC/C/15/Add.90, Concluding observations on initial report, paras. 24 and 45; CRC/C/15/Add.231, Concluding observations on second report, paras. 35 and 36; CRC/C/JPN/CO/3, Concluding observations on third report, paras. 7, 8, 47, 48, 56 an.157; CAT/C/JPN/CO/2, Concluding observations on second report, para. 23 and CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, Concluding observations on sixth report, para. 25.
[84] JS 1, page 3.
[85] JFBA, page 5-6.
[86] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.88; 147.86.
[87] JS3, page 1, 2 and 4. See also, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.86 (Armenia); (Act No. 123 of 1950, the last amendment in 2016 hereinafter MHA).
[88] HRW, page 1. See also, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.16(Slovenia); 147.17(Spain, India, Iraq); 147.18(Kuwait); 147.19(Argentina).
[89] AI, page 2. See also, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.6 (Rwanda, Switzerland); 147.7(Uruguay); 147.8(Australia); 147.93 (Italy); 147.94(Namibia); 147.95 (Netherlands); 147.96(Norway); 147.97(Argentina); 147.98(Australia); 147.99(Mexico); 147.100(Italy); 147.101(Ireland); 147.102(Germany); 147.103(France); 147.104(Finland); 147.105(Norway); 147.106(Portugal); 147.107 (Slovakia); 147.108(Slovenia); 147.109(Spain); 147.110(Switzerland); 147.111(Turkey); 147.112(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and 147.113 (Austria). See also, International law and standards prohibit the use of the death penalty against people with mental and

intellectual disabilities. For instance, the former UN Commission on Human Rights urged States not to impose capital punishment on or execute "a person suffering from any mental or intellectual disabilities", UN Commission on Human Rights, Resolution 2005/59, Question of the Death Penalty, 20 April 2005.

110 JFBA, page 11.

111 JS3, page 3. See also, A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.86 (Armenia).

112 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14 paras 147.161, 147.160.

113 MINDAN, page 3; LAZAK, page 2.

114 MINDAN, page 3.

115 AIPR, page 2; JS2, page 2; JS7, page 3 and 7; JS11, pages 3-4.

116 JS2, page 11; JS7, pages 2 and 7; JS14, page 3.

117 JMAHR, page 2 and JFBA, page 9. See also A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.149(Bangladesh).

118 JMAHR, page 3, 4, and 5. See also, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.72(Cuba), 147.160(Germany).

119 JMAHR, page 4 and 5.

120 CS, page 2, 5-7.

121 JFBA, page 4. See also CERD recommendation in 2014 (CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9).

122 ACMI.a, page 5.

123 JS 11, page 3.

124 JS11, pages 2 and 6.

125 ACMI.a, page 5 and JS14, page 3. See also A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.34 (Canada), 147.115 (Senegal).

126 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.164, 147.86, 147.167, 147.166, 147.162, 147.165, 147.163.

127 HRW, page 3. See also, A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.162 (Iran (Islamic Republic of)), and 147.163 (Myanmar).

128 AI, page 7 and APMM, page 5.

129 AI, page 6 and JFBA, page 10. See also, HRC, Concluding observations on the sixth periodic report of Japan, CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, August 2014, and CERD Concluding observations on the combined seventh to ninth periodic reports of Japan, CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, September 2014.See also, Human Rights Committee, Concluding observations on the sixth periodic report of Japan, CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, 10 August 2014, available at tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2FJPN%2FCO%2F6&Lang=en.

130 JS9, page 5.

131 SMI, page 1- 2 and APMM, page 2-3.

132 SMI, page 2, APMM, page 3 and JFBA, page 10. See also, HRC, Concluding observations on the sixth periodic report of Japan, CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, August 2014.
CERD, Concluding observations on the combined seventh to ninth periodic reports of Japan, CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, September 2014.

133 APMM, pages 2 and 3.

134 APMM, page 3.

135 MINDAN, page 7 and 9.

136 AI, page 5. See also, Japan International Cooperation Agency, Japanese Initiative for the future of Syrian Refugees, available at www.jica.go.jp/syria/english/office/others/jsr.html.

137 AI, page 7.

138 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.78, 147.167, 147.166, 147.164, 147.60.

139 JS10, page 6 and 11.